



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,845	05/13/2005	Philippe Carabin	0510-1106	6267
465 7590 03/06/2008 YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MAUST, TIMOTHY LEWIS	
			ART UNIT 3751	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/511,845

Applicant(s)

CARABIN, PHILIPPE

Examiner

Timothy L. Maust

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/19/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marchau.

In regard to claims 1, 2, 5 and 6, the Marchau reference discloses a device that includes:

at least one "deposition actuator" 3 of a product,

"means which enable to adjust" 6 the quantity of product deposited by said actuator, "means to determine the quantity" 11 of product deposited by said actuator (i.e., volume is calculated by measuring flow rate),
"means to compare the quantity" 12 of product deposited with the desired quantity of product to be deposited, and
"means which enable to act upon said means of adjustment of the actuator" 13, to re-adjust automatically the quantity of product deposited during subsequent deposition operations, in case of difference noticed between the quantity of product effectively deposited and the desired quantity of product to be deposited.

Claims 1-8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Belser et al.

In regard to claim 1, 5 and 14, the Belser et al. reference discloses a device that includes:

at least one "deposition actuator" 14 of a product,
"means which enable to adjust" 120 the quantity of product deposited by said actuator, "means to determine the quantity" 63 of product deposited by said actuator,
"means to compare the quantity" (126, 130 and 134) of product deposited with the desired quantity of product to be deposited, and

"means which enable to act upon said means of adjustment of the actuator" 70, to re-adjust automatically the quantity of product deposited during subsequent deposition operations, in case of difference noticed between the quantity of product effectively deposited and the desired quantity of product to be deposited.

In regard to claims 2-4 and 6, see column 4, line 66 - column 5, line 5.

In regard to claim 7, see process control circuit 70 in Figure 5.

In regard to claim 8, see column 5, line 19 – column 6, line 47.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belser et al. in view of Arnarson et al.

In regard to claims 9 and 16, the Belser et al. reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed (discussed supra), but doesn't disclose the use of cameras to record the relief of the dispensed material. However, the Arnarson et al. reference discloses another system that records the relief (i.e., volume) of a dispensed object by using a camera 1 and microprocessor 9. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the camera

recording system for the ultrasonic system on the Belser et al. device as, for example, taught by Annarson et al. wherein so doing would amount to mere substitution of one functional equivalent relief recording system for another within the same art and the selection of any of these relief recording systems would work equally well in the Belser et al. device. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide at least two cameras in the system, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

In regard to claim 10, inasmuch structure that is defined by "additional means", any signal in the recording system meets the claim limitation.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-13 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art of record pertains to various dispensing systems, similar to Applicant's device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy L. Maust whose telephone number is (571) 272-4891. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. 7:00-5:30pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy Lewis Maust/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751

Tlm
2/27/08